

1. With the addition of SOW 6 areas to the Mission Suitability Volume in the Final RFP, would NASA please consider increasing the volume page limit to 85 pages?

A: The page limitations stated in the Final RFP (See Section L.14 Proposal Preparation – General Instructions) will remain unchanged.

2. Could you provide a Microsoft Word/soft copy of the PPQ?

A: The Past Performance Questionnaire is available in Adobe PDF.

3. RTO 2 SOW states “Most proposals will also be sent to one or more mail reviewers, and the PO and panel will need access to those.” How many mail-in reviews should be anticipated? How many mail-in reviews should be anticipated? (This affects the ODC line item of Postage/FedEx shipping, as well as labor hours for date (sic) entry.)

A: For the purposes of RTO #2, 80% of the proposals received will be sent out for mail-in review. 25% of that number will be sent out for two mail-in reviews; 75% will be sent out for a single mail-in review. This yields a requirement for 500 total mail-in reviews.

4. RTO 2 SOW states “Some panelists will be participating via teleconference or other virtual participation supplied by the contractor.” How many panelists are anticipated to participate virtually? This affects the ODC line item of “Peer Review Travel,” as well as labor hours for logistics/travel arrangements.

A: For the purposes of RTO #2, on each panel half of the civil servant and half of the non-civil servant participants will participate virtually.

5. RTO 2 SOW states “After panels are completed, there will be multiple proposal review and selection meetings at NASA Headquarters.” How many review and selection meetings will take place? This affects labor hours for the requirement of taking minutes during these minutes.

A: For the purposes of RTO #2, there will be two all-day “proposal review and selection meetings at NASA Headquarters.”

6. Should Offerors assume that all panels will take place in proximity of NASA HQ, or are other NASA centers involved?

A: The vast majority of in-person panels occur in the Washington, DC metro area. The NRESS contract supports Agency-wide needs, however, offerors can expect that between 5-7% of in-person panels each year will occur in metro areas outside the Washington, DC area, at or near other NASA centers.

7. Can NASA clarify why the labor category of Support Scientists are listed as being onsite positions when no other positions are onsite? Is there a requirement for these positions to be onsite at HQ? Will NASA provide workspace and equipment for these personnel?

A: The government has found that support scientists best fulfill the requirements of particular NRESS support activities when those individuals are located onsite at NASA Headquarters. NASA will provide workstations for up to five contractor personnel.

8. Exhibits 3 & 9 request data for contract years 1 through 5, and Exhibits 5 & 6 request data for contract years 1 through 6. Can the government please provide the anticipated period of performance dates and expected number of contract years so that we can ensure compliance with the specific data required per contract year?

A: Per F.3, the Effective Ordering Period of the contract is 5 years from the effective date of the contract. Per I.7, Indefinite Quantity, the Contractor may be required to make deliveries under this contract up to one year from the end of the contract's effective ordering period. The current

contract ends July 30, 2015, the Government anticipates the effective award to begin no later than August 1, 2015.

9. Given a Joint Venture composed of a mentor/protégé team, where the protégé small business is the lead manager and the mentor large business takes a secondary role, will NASA evaluate the lead small business past performance as more significant than the large business past performance? Or will NASA evaluate all past performance of JV partners equally?

A: A Joint Venture is considered 1 company and as such, the past performance of each company comprising the JV will be evaluated. There is no weighting of significance for the JV partners.

10. How would NASA evaluate the past performance of a company who was the previous member of a Joint Venture and is now participating on a new team? Would NASA evaluate their previous experience with the joint venture as there was no direct contractual relationship with these companies on the previous contract?

A: NASA will evaluate the past performance of a company with previous experience as a joint venture. For example, if Company A was previously part of Joint Venture AB, but now they will be proposing as part of Joint Venture AC, the previous contract with AB will be considered as prime offeror performance under the past performance evaluation of proposal AC.

11. Question 24 (phases 3 questions) references a commercial data center in Reston, VA. Would NASA please elaborate on whether contractor staffing is required for this facility?

A: A commercial data center in Reston, Virginia hosts the NSPIRES production and test environment through a commercial service agreement between the data center provider and the NRESS incumbent. The data center delivers secure NSPIRES hosting and 24/7/365 availability to users of the system. The incumbent's information technology personnel visit the site periodically but no NRESS successor contractor's staff supplements the commercial data center provider's hosting services. The NSPIRES commercial service agreement may permissibly migrate from the NRESS incumbent to the successor if a successor wishes to assume the responsibility for it.

12. Where is the current contractor operations center located? Will new contractor take over the lease at this facility for project performance?

A: Leasing arrangements should be provided by the offeror in its proposal response.

13. Regarding the subject procurement, would it be possible to receive Standard Forms 30 and 33 (Amendment 1) in a Word and/or writable format?

A: Standard Form 30 and Amendment 1 are available in Adobe Acrobat PDF. A writable format is not available.

14. Page 83, Paragraph 4. The Government states in this paragraph that it will not issue a separate task order "for overall contract program management." It also states that we are to "clearly indicate how program management costs will be captured and charged on a task-by-task basis." No place, however, does the government define "overall contract program management." In the past, numerous personnel have charged various management tasks, including tasks for IT, Logistics, Mission Support Managers, the Program Manager, administrative support, etc. Is the labor for all of these activities to be spread across all RTOs (either as G&A or direct labor) and other tasks or is only the program manager considered in the term "overall contract program management"?

A: The Government does not intend to issue a separate task order for overall contract program management. Accordingly, **in accordance with the Offeror's approved accounting system**, clearly indicate how program management costs will be captured and charged on a task by task basis during

contract performance. **Program management costs must be included in the RTO cost estimates** in accordance with the instructions in L.17 Cost Volume, Section 2.

The Prime Offeror shall complete the OFFEROR CONTRACT MANAGEMENT/ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS Section of Exhibit 1A, filling in all anticipated program management and administrative support required for this effort and direct charged via Offeror (and/or subcontractor, if applicable) labor categories and hours (Exhibit 2B) in addition to any labor-oriented recurring other direct costs (ODCs) and/or cost estimating relationships (CERs) consistent with **Exhibit 7**. The Prime Offeror shall then add all of the management and administrative proposed labor costs and labor-oriented recurring ODCs/CERs to drive the Subtotal Offeror Management/Administrative Labor Costs. **For the purposes of bidding, all Management and Administrative Costs shall be assumed offsite.**

15. Will the IT support be included in a separate IT task or are all of the activities in SOW Sections 6.0 and 7.0 also to be spread across all tasks, either in G&A or as a direct charge?

**A: See previous answer at question #14.**

16. Page 77, Paragraphs 1, 2, and 3. In these paragraphs, the Government asks for an approach including a staffing plan and cost allocations for RTOs 1 and 3. Are we to include the labor or costs for "overall contract program management" stipulated on Page 83, Paragraph 4 as part of this estimate, or are those instructions only for the cost proposal.

**A: See previous answer at question #14.**

17. Page 77, Paragraphs 1, 2, and 3. In these paragraphs, the Government asks for staffing plans and schedules for the activities in the SOW's Section 6, excluding 6.5. Similarly, on Page 78, the Government asks for a similar staffing plan and schedules for the activities in the SOW's Section 7. These are level of effort activities. Largely they will continue from the first day of the contract to the last. For how many years are we to propose staffing in the staffing plan? For how many years are we to propose schedules?

**A: Staffing plans and schedules for SOW sections, as identified in the RFP, should cover the entire effective ordering period.**

18. Page 80 last paragraph continuing on to page 81. This paragraph discusses the Total Compensation Plan. While this requirement is to be in Volume II of the proposal where costs typically are not permitted, may we include average salaries for employee labor categories in our Total Compensation Plan?

**A: As stated in NFS 1852.231-71: *The proposal shall include a total compensation plan. This plan shall address all proposed labor categories, including those personnel subject to union agreements, the Service Contract Act, and those exempt from both of the above. The total compensation plan shall include the salaries/wages, fringe benefits and leave programs proposed for each of these categories of labor. The plan also shall include a discussion of the consistency of the plan among the categories of labor being proposed. Differences between benefits offered professional and non-professional employees shall be highlighted. The requirements of this plan may be combined with that required by the clause at FAR 52.222-46, "Evaluation of Compensation for Professional Employees."***

19. Regarding Past Performance Volume: Answer to prior questions (see below) appear to indicate that the value threshold would be \$1M per year for both prime and significant subcontractors. But in L.18(a) on page 92 the instructions state significant subcontractors are to provide past performance information for efforts "...with a minimum average annual cost/fee incurred of at least 10% of the estimated average annual dollar value of the proposed significant subcontractor." This could be significantly less than \$1M per year and thus a large number of efforts. Will NASA use the \$1M per year value for subcontractors as well?

**Q: Will NASA consider changing the recency to no more than five (5) years ago, and \$2 million total contract value for the prime, \$1M for major subcontractors?**

A: In reference to Draft RFP Section L.18(a) Past Performance Volume: the language will be revised to reflect that the requirement will be for recent contracts having a minimum average annual cost/fee of \$1M within the last 3 years of the RFP release date.

A: The \$1M average annual minimum relevancy threshold only applies to the prime offeror. A significant subcontractor is defined as any proposed subcontractor that is estimated to meet/exceed an average annual cost/fee of \$1M for this requirement. The minimum relevancy threshold for the significant subcontractor is at least 10% of the estimated average annual dollar value of the proposed significant subcontractor. Therefore, if a proposed subcontractor for this effort has a proposed average annual cost/fee of \$1M (meeting the definition of a significant subcontractor), **the offeror shall provide relevant current/past contract references that have a minimum average annual cost/fee incurred at/above \$100K (10% of \$1M) for that significant subcontractor.**

Note: The time period for submitting past performance information was revised between the Draft RFP and Final RFP to “within the last 5 years of the RFP release date.”

20. Regarding Cost volume instructions: On page 82, the instructions state “A proposed significant subcontractor shall provide the same cost exhibits and supporting information that is requested from the prime.” But there are other locations that state some items are only required from the prime. For instance, on page 84 subsection (c). Which set of directions are we to follow.

A: A proposed significant subcontractor shall complete and submit Exhibits 2A, 2B and 4 through 12A, and provide the same supporting information that is requested from the Prime Offeror.

Revisions to L.17 Cost Volume, Section 1 will be provided in Amendment 2 to the RFP.

21. Do we need to use SF-30 & 33 that are attached as .IFM files? When we try to open them using eForms, we get blank forms or can we use the SF-33 on Page 4 of main RFP doc?

A: The SF-33 is located in the Final RFP titled *Final RFP NNH13465022R*, dated January 9, 2014.

The SF-30 for Amendment 1 has been uploaded. These items can be found:

[https://www.fbo.gov/index?s=opportunity&mode=form&id=b7f7a27256438c05093b5362355ebc26&tab=core&\\_cview=1](https://www.fbo.gov/index?s=opportunity&mode=form&id=b7f7a27256438c05093b5362355ebc26&tab=core&_cview=1).

22. We are requesting an extended delivery schedule to respond to the subject RFP.

A: The RFP due date has been extended to March 4, 2014.